DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 231 HE 005 674

AUTHOR Colvard, R.; Bennett, A. M.
TITLE Patterns of Concentration in Large Foundations' Grants to U. S. Colleges and Universities ACT Research Report No. 63.
INSTITUTION American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa. Research and Development Div.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 32p.
AVAILABLE FROM ACT Publications, P. O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Colleges; Computer Programs; *Educational Finance; *Financial Support; *Foundation Programs; *Grants; *Higher Education; Research Projects; Universities

ABSTRACT

In order to identify long-obscured patterns of concentration in grants made by large private foundations to various types of colleges and universities in this country, a computer program capable of annual trend analyses was developed and utilized with data from the currently most comprehensive and accessible source, the grants index of "Foundation News." All grants reported in 1963, 1966, 1969, and 1970 and 276 foundations having most of the national assets and making most of the grants for all purposes, including higher education, were analyzed. Of these 276, each of which had assets of at least $8 million, a range of from 112 (1963) to 184 (1970) made grants of at least $10,000 each to a range of from 293 (1963) specifically identifiable U. S. colleges and universities. The major findings about the concentration among grantors was that each year at least 46 percent of the grants and 75 percent of the actual funds involved came from no more than 25 of the foundations, including the Ford Foundation. Although there was a slight trend toward more widespread foundation participation in academic grantmaking, the ratio of college or university recipients per foundation stayed about 2.75 per year. (Author/MJM)

ACT RESEARCH REPORT

ED 093231

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No. 63

63

April 1974

PATTERNS OF CONCENTRATION IN LARGE FOUNDATIONS' GRANTS TO U.S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

R. Colvard
A. M. Bennett

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

PUBLISHED BY THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING PROGRAM

P. O. BOX 168, IOWA CITY, IOWA 52240

HE 005 674

Prepared by the Research and Development Division
The American College Testing Program

© 1974 by The American College Testing Program

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America

For additional copies write:
ACT Publications
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

(Check or money order must accompany request.) Price: $1.00

PATTERNS OF CONCENTRATION IN LARGE FOUNDATIONS' GRANTS TO U.S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ABSTRACT

In order to identify long-obscured patterns of concentration in grants made by large private foundations to various types of colleges and universities in this country, a computer program capable of annual trend analyses was developed, and utilized with data from the currently most comprehensive and accessible source, the grants index of *Foundation News*. All grants reported in 1963, 1966, 1969, and 1970 by 276 foundations having, nationally, most of the assets and making most of the grants for all purposes, including higher education, were analyzed. Of these 276, each of which had assets of at least $8 million, a range of from 112 (1963) to 184 (1970) made grants of at least $10,000 each, to a range of from 293 (1963) to 515 (1970) specifically identifiable U.S. colleges and universities.

The major finding on concentration among grantors was that each year at least 46% of the grants and 75% of the actual funds involved came from no more than 25 of the foundations, including the giant Ford Foundation. Although there was a slight trend toward more widespread foundation participation in academic grantmaking, the ratio of college or university recipients per foundation stayed at about 2.75 per year.

Among grantee institutions, there was more concentration by control type and functional type than by geographic location. No state normally had more than 10 colleges or universities ranking in the top 100 recipients (in actual funds granted each separate year). But private institutions (of all types) represented about two-thirds of the top 100 such recipients each year. And in 1970 reports, for example, 38 of the top 50 were private institutions; they received close to 81.9% of the nearly $149.3 million going to the top 50, and about 58.1% of the approximately $210.2 million total from the 184 actual grantor foundations for that year. Finally, from 56 to 60 of the overall top 100 recipient institutions each year were universities. The latter pattern is strongly similar to that in major federal funding of U.S. higher education.

More extensive analyses of foundation grants, and comparisons with federal funding patterns are becoming possible and should be of value to scholars and policymakers alike.

PATTERNS OF CONCENTRATION IN LARGE FOUNDATIONS' GRANTS TO U.S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES[1]

Richard Colvard
Andre M. Bennett[2]

For decades the absence of adequate evidence has made it difficult to trace trends in grants to U.S. colleges and universities from most of our many large philanthropic foundations. But more data is becoming available; and recent development of a computer program (Fundflow) capable of annual re-categorization and analysis of such information now makes it possible both to show predominant distribution patterns from year to year, and to summarize general characteristics of several hundred major foundations involved and also of the academic institutions receiving most of the funds.

This initial report deals neither with the stated purposes of the grants nor their probable results but rather with their patterns of concentration, e.g., the extent to which the funds involved tend to come from certain types of foundations and go to certain types of academic institutions. It documents a definite but slightly declining tendency for a "top 25" foundations (usually of the "general purpose" type) to make most of the grants, and especially those including most of the funds involved, in each year studied (1963, 1966, 1969, and 1970). And it also shows a strong concentration of support for large eminent universities, a financial concentration strikingly similar to that long evident in the more thoroughly reported federal funding of higher education, with the predictable difference that the foundations concentrate more on supporting private universities.

Many other such findings on the distribution of grants made by 276 large private foundations to specifically identifiable U.S. colleges and universities are summarized in this report. But no data on the foundations' general and indirect grants involving higher education are included. And only a few comparisons of the patterns of concentration in both foundation and federal funding are attempted, after the main findings on foundation grants and grantees are presented. No specific policy implications are intended, but there is an underlying assumption that the availability of more specific information on foundation grant patterns would probably make both public and private funding of higher education more effective. Such reports, ideally, should be readily comparable with those already available on many important aspects of federal funding. Some tables of types ultimately desirable to have available annually are included in the Appendix.

---

[1]This is a revised version of a paper read at the Pacific Sociological Association annual meeting in Portland, Oregon, on April 17, 1972. Several special questions about the foundation data were answered by Marianna O. Lewis and Lee Noe, of the Foundation Center in New York. Robert Loycano of the National Science Foundation helped clarify the comparisons with federal data, and many overall findings as well. The Fundflow computer program used was originally developed for the senior author by M. Krowl of the Computer Center at the University of California at Santa Cruz. It was subsequently modified by G. Gibson of the Computer Center at the State University of New York at Buffalo (whose Sociology Department supported early work, as did the Research Foundation of the State University of New York), and extensively rewritten and generalized by N. Larsen and M. Matyas of the Computer Center at The University of Iowa. The latter work and related data processing were supported by The American College Testing Program while the senior author was a postdoctoral fellow during the summer of 1971.

[2]Colvard is a professor of sociology at Southern Oregon College, and Bennett is an assistant professor of sociology at Erindale College of the University of Toronto.

Procedure

The major data source for grantors was *The Foundation Directory*, Edition 3 (1967), henceforth *FD3*. For grantees it was *American Universities and Colleges*, (1968), *AUC 68*. For grants it was the index of *Foundation News*, *FN*. Of 17,303 then known to its editors, *FD3* included 6,803 private foundations. Each either had assets of at least $200,000 or made grants of at least $10,000 in the closest year of record, usually 1965.[3] Of those 6,803 foundations, 237 (or .014 of the 17,303 known) stood out sharply. Each had assets of from $10 million up to the Ford Foundation's over $3 billion. Their combined assets constituted 74% (about $15 billion) of the $20.3 billion assets of the 17,303 known foundations. They also made 61% of the grants for all purposes reported (from the grants index of *FN*), including those in the general category of higher education (*FD3*, 1967, Table 7, p.22).

To that predominant set of 237 foundations, 39 others which research by a congressional committee (1968) had shown to be in or near the same asset size class, were added. The final N for foundations analyzed was, therefore, 276 rather than 237, and the asset size range was from $8 million to $3+ billion.

All grants made by all 276 foundations reported in *FN* in 1963, 1966, 1969, and 1970[4] were actually analyzed.[5] But the tables to be reported here concentrate on the number and percent of those 276 very large foundations clearly making grants to U.S. colleges and universities (CUs) identifiable by name in the grants index of *FN* and also in *AUC 68*.

Findings

Number and Dollar Value of Large Foundations' Actual Academic Grants

How many of the 276 very large foundations studied actually made any academic grants, i.e., grants of at least $10,000 to a specific (U.S.) CU identifiable in *FN* and *AUC 68*? How many such actual grantors made most of the grants? And, considering the actual dollars granted rather than the number of grants, how many foundations provided most of the funds?

Table 1 indicates that the number of actual academic grantors ranged from 112 of 276 (or 41%) in 1963, erratically upward to 184 of 276 (or 67%) in 1970. An indeterminable part of that increase was probably due to improved reporting rather than increased interest in higher education. But even acknowledging fuller reporting after 1963, Table 1 shows that from half to two-thirds of the 276 foundations made at least one grant[6] to a college or university in this country in each year studied.

Table 2, however, shows how extensively the number of grants given each year was concentrated in comparatively few of the foundations. Not surprisingly, the mammoth Ford Foundation's grants were at least 12% of the total number each year. The

---

[3]Annual summary totals in *FN* showing amounts for higher education will not be the same as those derived from Fundflow analyses because the latter include grants actually going to specific U.S. CUs but categorized in *FN* under, for example, "medical research," rather than "higher education." It should also be noted that *FN* then excluded grants under $10,000, some renewal grants, and many "alma mater" grants, i.e., ones in which there was a presumed special relation with the donor. The latter type amounted to about $10.6 million, $14.8 million, and $21.7 million in 1966, 1969, and 1970 editions of *FN*, respectively.

[4]Because of delays by foundations in reporting, the data in *FN* may be up to 2 years behind the actual granting of funds, a fact complicating comparisons with federal grants.

[5]The Fundflow coding included: foundation identification number; year grant reported; college identification number; philanthropic purpose as reported in *FN*, e.g., "higher education," or "medical research"; focus on teaching or research; dollar amount; administrative category, e.g., endowment; and academic field, e.g., chemistry. The foundation and college codes included those for size, location, functional type, and various other descriptive characteristics. Later reports will present findings on many of these other measures, and on nonacademic and foreign grant patterns as well.

[6]As with federal funding, much of large-scale private foundation grant-making is undoubtedly defined as being given not so much *to* as *through* U.S. CUs, to purchase available expertise in science or, for example, in international relations.

Ford *trend* was downward, from 21%, 166 of 789 grants from the 112 of 276 foundations given in 1963, to 13%, 198 of 1,496 grants from 184 of 276 foundations in 1970. But the top 25 foundations (in dollars granted each separate year, and including Ford each year) tended to give close to half of the total number of grants each time. They did share Ford's downward trend here, shifting from 71% of the grants in 1963, when 563 of 789 grants were from the top 25, to 47% in 1970, when the top 25 gave 696 of 1,496 grants. And when the number of grants made by the top 100 academic grantors (in dollars granted each separate year) is considered, the concentration of grants is at least 86% each year.

TABLE 1

Number and Percent of Actual Academic Grantors among 276 U.S. Private Foundations with Assets of at Least $8 Million

Total Foundations in Study	Academic Grantors 1963		Academic Grantors 1966		Academic Grantors 1969		Academic Grantors 1970	
	No.	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*
276	112	41	159	58	143	52	184	67

Note.—Grantors must have made at least one grant of at least $10,000 to a U.S. college or university specifically identifiable in the grants index of *Foundation News* for the year indicated.

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Actual Academic Grants by Subgroups of 276 U.S. Private Foundations with Assets of at Least $8 Million (Total Academic Grantors, Top 100, Top 25, and Ford Foundation)

Subgroups of 276 Foundations	1963			1966			1969			1970		
	No. Fdns.	*No. Gts.*	*% of Gts.*	*No. Fdns.*	*No. Gts.*	*% of Gts.*	*No. Fdns.*	*No. Gts.*	*% of Gts.*	*No. Fdns.*	*No. Gts.*	*% of Gts.*
Total Academic Grantors	112	789	100.0	159	1,176	100.0	143	1,319	100.0	184	1,496	100.0
Top 100		776	98.4		1,072	91.1		1,247	94.5		1,294	86.5
Top 25		563	71.3		608	51.7		666	50.5		696	46.5
Ford Fdn. only		166	21.0		143	12.2		213	16.1		198	13.2

TABLE 3

Amount and Percent of Actual Academic Funds Granted by Subgroups of 276 U.S. Private Foundations with Assets of at Least $8 Million (Total Academic Grantors, Top 100, Top 25, and Ford Foundation)

Subgroups of 276 Foundations	1963			1966			1969			1970		
	No. Fdns.	*$ Million*	*% of $*	*No. Fdns.*	*$ Million*	*% of $*	*No. Fdns.*	*$ Million*	*% of $*	*No. Fdns.*	*$ Million*	*% of $*
Total Academic Grantors	112	109.1	100.0	159	206.6	100.0	143	234.3	100.0	184	210.2	100.0
Top 100		108.9	99.8		203.8	98.9		232.3	99.1		203.1	96.6
Top 25		91.2	83.6		174.0	84.4		183.8	78.4		157.0	74.7
Ford Fdn. only		30.3	27.8		98.6	47.8		39.7	16.9		43.8	20.8

Note.—Funds granted to U.S. colleges and universities specifically identifiable in the grants index of *Foundation News*, listing grants of at least $10,000 each for the year indicated.

Findings in Table 3 show an even greater concentration in actual dollars provided by the predominant academic grantors than in frequency of grants made. Predictably, Ford funds still loom large: the pattern there is erratic[7] but the Ford share of total academic funds given was about 28% in 1963, and still over 20% in 1970. More significantly, each year the top 25 foundations (again including Ford)[8] supplied at least approximately 75% of the funds traced in this study, despite the appearance of the same slight trend toward increased dispersion already noted for the number of grants. Furthermore, the top 100 foundations (including Ford)[9] granted over 97% of the funds each year, despite the increase in the number of actual grantors involved (or reported)—from 112 of 276 in 1963, to 184 of 276 in 1970—and also despite the erratically upward trend in actual dollars granted—from $109 million in 1963, to $210 million in 1970.

Functional Type, Regional Location, and Asset Size Class of "Top 100" Foundations

F. Emerson Andrews (1967) has distinguished five types of U.S. private foundations, each of which is represented in the top 100 foundations already generally noted as predominant in grant patterns each separate year studied. His categories show the form of legal incorporation more than the actual programs the foundations undertake. But using them, as in Table 4, at least helps counter the common tendency, which is unavoidable altogether, even in this study, to lump together not only all private giving but all foundations in ways which often obscure important differences.[10]

Table 4 shows unmistakably that of the five types, the "general purpose" foundation stands out as the major source of academic funds of the kind studied here. This clearly is the most publicly prominent type as well, represented at present by, for example, The Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and The Rockefeller Foundation. At least 71 such

[7]Ford, for example, started to phase out its Special Program of capital grants after 1966 (Ford, 1966).

[8]Without Ford, the top 24 foundations should show up as supplying approximately these percentages of total funds reported in this study: 55% in 1963, 37% in 1966, 62% in 1969, and 54% in 1970.

[9]Without Ford, the top 99 foundations would be responsible for 72% of the total funds supplied in 1963, 51% in 1966, 82% in 1969, and 76% in 1970.

[10]Another common difficulty in previous reporting of private philanthropic giving is that of lumping Ford Foundation grants in with others, despite the severe skewing this can sometimes produce. Cf. Tables 2 and 3; footnotes 8 and 9 above; and, for example, data in Levi and Vorsanger (1968).

TABLE 4

Number and Percent of Five Types of Private Foundations among the top 100 in Total Funds in Actual Academic Grants

Type of Foundation	Number and Percent of Each Type of Foundation in Top 100 in Academic Grant Dollars			
	1963	*1966*	*1969*	*1970*
1. General Purpose, e.g., The Ford Foundation, Carnegie Corporation	72	75	72	71
2. Special Purpose, e.g., Association for the Aid of Crippled Children	8	10	10	9
3. Community, e.g., Chicago Community Trust	8	3	4	3
4. Corporation, e.g., United States Steel Foundation, Ford Motor Company Fund	9	8	9	12
5. Family or Misc., e.g., Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, Bing Fund, Inc.	3	4	5	5
	100	100	100	100

Note.—Type information is from *The Foundation Directory*, Edition 3, 1967, plus correspondence with the editor, Marianna O. Lewis.

foundations were in each year's top 100 in total dollars granted.

Special purpose foundations, such as the Association for the Aid of Crippled Children or the Maurice Falk Medical Fund, tended to constitute about 10% of the top 100 each year. So did a third type, the corporation (or "company") foundation, such as the Ford Motor Company Fund or the United States Steel Foundation. The latter type of foundation is often by law more closely connected with the firm's own operations, locations, and employees.

The final two types represented in Table 4 are the community foundations, such as the Chicago Community Trust or the Cleveland Foundation, which coordinate much of the philanthropy in a particular city, and the "family or miscellaneous" foundations, such as the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, which vary greatly in size and scope of actual philanthropic activity. In the years studied, these two types combined constituted no more than 11 of the top 100 academic grantor foundations.

Whatever their types, where did the foundations ranking in a top 100 each separate year tend to be located? In the regional categorizations utilized in Table 5, the Mid-Atlantic Region (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) had the headquarters of at least 50 of the top 100 foundations each year (Cf. Rosenquist, 1954). Next was the East North Central Region (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin), with a range of from 14 to 21 of the 100. Two other regions had from 6 to 10 of the top 100. One was the South Atlantic Region (including Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, D.C., South Carolina, and especially North Carolina). The other was the West South Central Region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and especially Texas). The small remainder of the top 100 tended to be scattered each year through the other six regions, although there were none in Hawaii or Alaska, arbitrarily designated as a residual region in these categorizations.[11]

[11]Hawaii has some long-established large foundations, especially the Bernice P. Bishop Estate. However, the latter's income is by charter primarily for the Kamehameha School for native Hawaiians, and it is no longer categorized as a foundation comparable to others here.

TABLE 5

Regional Location of Top 100 Private Foundations in Actual Academic Grant Funds Provided

Region of Headquarters Office of Top 100 Foundations in Academic Grant Dollars	1963 No. & %	1966 No. & %	1969 No. & %	1970 No. & %
1. New England (Conn., Maine, Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt.)	4	2	3	2
2. Mid-Atlantic (N.J., N.Y., Pa.)	54	53	50	50
3. East North Central (Ill., Ind., Mich., Ohio, Wis.)	21	16	14	18
4. West North Central (Iowa, Kans., Minn., Mo., Nebr., N. Dak., S. Dak.)	3	4	4	6
5. South Atlantic (D.C., Del., Fla., Ga., Md., N.C., S.C., Va., W. Va.)	6	8	10	9
6. East South Central (Ala., Ky., Miss., Tenn.)	1	1	0	1
7. West South Central (Ark., La., Okla., Tex.)	6	10	10	10
8. Mountain (Ariz., Colo., Idaho, Mont., Nev., N. Mex., Utah, Wyo.)	3	3	4	2
9. Pacific (Calif., Oreg., Wash.)	2	3	5	2
10. Other (Alaska, Hawaii)	0	0	0	0
	100	100	100	100

Source.—*The Foundation Directory*, Edition 3, 1967.

Finally, for this series of tables, how big were the top 100 foundations as ranked in total dollars granted each separate year? Because the range of asset size was so extensive—from about $8 million for some of the foundations added to the original set of 237, to over $3 billion for Ford—it was difficult to establish coherent categories. This was especially the case when the source data itself unavoidably included inconsistencies in, for example, whether the foundations reported assets at ledger or at actual market value (*FD3*, 1967). Still, within the compromise categories finally derived, there were some fairly definite patterns.

As Table 6 shows, one main finding was that from 50% to 70% of the top foundations each year were in the asset size categories under $49.9 million, and especially in the $10-19.9 million bracket (the range here was from 19 to 25 such foundations of the total 100 each year). Those with assets of $100-499.9 million were the final group especially noteworthy: they ranged from 13 to 18 of the top 100 in various years.

Frequency, Dollar Value, and Dispersion of Grants to All and to Top 100 Colleges and Universities

The next three tables show three clear trends in the data dealing with the overall distribution of actual academic grants made, by all the foundations studied. The first, as shown in Table 7, is for more academic grants to be given each year, and usually by more foundations. The next, also shown in Table 7, is for the ratio of actual grantees to grantor foundations to remain quite stable despite the typical increases in foundations and grants through the years. The last, as shown in Tables 8 and 9, is for comparatively few CUs, of about 2,500 potential grantees near the midpoint of this study (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967), to get most of the grants, and especially to get most of the funds the grants provide.

The stability in the ratio of grantees to grantors, evident in Table 7, can be summarized as an average of 2.8 CU grantees per foundation per year studied. The range was from 2.6 in 1963 to 3.1 in 1969, and the

TABLE 6

Asset Size Range of Top 100 Private Foundations in Actual Academic Grant Funds Provided

Top 100 Foundations Size of Endowment, Net Worth, or Active Capital ($ Million)[a]	1963 No. & %		1966 No. & %		1969 No. & %		1970 No. & %	
8 - 9.99	4		2		1		4	
10 - 19.99	22		19		25		24	
20 - 29.99	17	59%	17	70%	11	50%	12	62%
30 - 39.99	9		15		7		14	
40 - 49.99	7		7		6		8	
50 - 99.99	18		14		19		17	
100 - 499.99	16		18		18		13	
500 - 999.99	1	41%	1	30%	2	50%	2	38%
1,000 and up ($1 billion or more)	1		1		1		1	
Other[b]	5		6		10		5	
	100		100		100		100	

[a]The majority of the figures are for fiscal or calendar 1965, e.g., for 1969 values the top 100 include 67 for 1965, 82/100 each year are market values, according to the main source, *The Foundation Directory*, Edition 3, 1967.

[b]These figures are from the U.S. Congress (1968, pp. 228-259), which indicates ledger values under $10 million but higher market values.

most recent figure was 2.8, in 1970. This fairly similar ratio continues through a quite persistent increase, which is noted in more detail in Table 1, in the number of foundations involved (from 112 or 41% of the 276 foundations in 1963, to 184 or 67% in 1970), although it should again be noted that improvements in reporting are probably hidden in the latter figures and also in the increases in CU grantees evident in Table 7.

Table 8 shows strikingly that the upward trend in the number of CUs getting at least one foundation grant does not change the consistency with which a top 5, 10, 25, 50, and 100 CUs are awarded the most actual funds in grants. The slight downward trend in such concentration is noteworthy, but should not obscure the main patterns. For example, over 83% of the money each year went to a top 100 colleges and universities. And each year a top 5 CUs received over 26% of the total foundation funds reported here.

The magnitude of grants is unquestionably important but is ideally understood in the context of a particular college's or university's goals and resources. What do the data show about the number rather than the dollar value of grants? Table 9 indicates that a top 5 CUs tended to get about 10% of the total number of grants each year, in contrast to the 26% of total funds involved. When the top 10 and top 25 CUs are considered, however, the pattern is somewhat different. The top 10 institutions in each separate year received the following approximate percentages of total grants awarded: 17% in 1963, 15% in 1966, 15% in 1969, and 17% again in 1970. And similarly, the top 25 received about 31% of the grants in 1963, 26% in 1966, 35% in 1969, and 31% again in 1970. Furthermore, the top 100 CUs still received a majority of the grants each time, although the tendency toward concentration was not so strong as that already found for actual funds distributed; and it was also diminishing slightly, from 68% of the total grants in 1963 to 54% in 1966, up to 60% in 1969, then back to 54% again in 1970. Comparable figures (Table 8) for dollars granted were 91%, 88%, 88%, and 84%.

TABLE 7

Number and Ratio of College or University Grantees and Grantor Foundations

Year	Yearly Total Number Grantor Foundations	Yearly Total Number Grantee CUs	Ratio: CU/Fdn.
1963	112	293	2.6
1966	159	449	2.8
1969	143	443	3.1
1970	184	515	2.8

TABLE 8

Amount and Percent of Total Funds Received by All and by Top 100, Top 50, Top 25, Top 10, and Top 5 Grantee Institutions (From All Academic Grantor Foundations Studied)

Grantee Subgroups	1963			1966			1969			1970		
	No. CUs	*Grants in $ Million*	*% of $*	*No. CUs*	*Grants in $ Million*	*% of $*	*No. CUs*	*Grants in $ Million*	*% of $*	*No. CUs*	*Grants in $ Million*	*% of $*
Total	293	109.1	100.0	449	206.1	100.0	443	234.3	100.0	515	210.2	100.0
Top 100		99.7	91.4		182.2	88.4		204.5	87.7		176.0	83.7
Top 50		86.6	79.4		156.2	75.8		175.8	75.0		149.3	71.0
Top 25		69.4	63.6		126.4	61.3		140.6	60.0		118.6	56.4
Top 10		43.8	40.2		90.1	43.7		94.2	40.2		80.6	38.4
Top 5		29.4	27.0		66.4	32.2		62.4	26.6		54.8	26.1

TABLE 9

Number and Percent of Total Academic Grants Received by All and by Top 100, Top 50, Top 25, and Top 5 Grantee Institutions (From All Academic Grantor Foundations Studied)

Grantee Subgroups	1963			1966			1969			1970		
	No. CUs	*No. Grants*	*% of Grants*	*No. CUs*	*No. Grants*	*% of Grants*	*No. CUs*	*No. Grants*	*% of Grants*	*No. CUs*	*No. Grants*	*% of Grants*
Total	293	789	100.0	449	1,176	100.0	443	1,319	100.0	515	1,496	100.0
Top 100		537	68.4		629	53.5		795	60.4		817	54.7
Top 50		392	49.7		463	39.4		620	47.1		636	42.6
Top 25		247	31.3		308	26.2		458	34.8		458	30.7
Top 10		132	16.7		176	15.0		195	14.8		260	17.4
Top 5		86	10.9		105	8.9		107	8.1		156	10.4

Control Type, Functional Type, State and Region of Top 100 College and University Grantees

The overall patterns of academic philanthropy being reported here have already been put in a somewhat broader perspective in Tables 4-6, which show some summary characteristics of the top 100 foundations (in total dollars awarded each separate year). The final four tables report similar information about the top 100 CU recipients of the most funds. Table 10 shows the distribution of such grantees by control type of institution, e.g., private nonsectarian, Protestant, state, or county sponsorship and control. Table 11 shows functional types, e.g., junior colleges, liberal arts colleges of various kinds, and universities of different degrees of complexity, represented in the top 100 recipients of funds. Finally, Tables 12 and 13, respectively, reveal the states and the regions of the U.S. in which the top 100 CUs (in total dollars granted each separate year) are located.

The central findings on control type are almost self-evident in Table 10. Nearly half of the top 100 CUs each year were private nonsectarian institutions, and about two-thirds were in some category of private control, whether nonsectarian, Protestant, or Catholic. Public institutions of various types received the traceable remainder of the grants. Among these, the state institutions stood out, comprising from 28 to 30 of the top 100 CUs each year.

The many functional types of institutions included in Table 11, it should be pointed out, are essentially those of *AUC 68*, which attempts to acknowledge the existence of forms and functions far more extensive than is indicated by such terms as "college" (or even "liberal arts college") and "university." Aside from those for such fairly distinct types as theological schools and medical colleges, and a too-ambiguous one for junior colleges, the main categories of interest in Table 11 are those which show the findings for distribution of funds by institutions offering different levels of degrees. Level II institutions, for example, offer only bachelor's and/or first professional degrees. Those in Level III also offer master's and/or second professional degrees. And Level IV institutions offer the doctorate and equivalent degrees as well (ordinarily) as those at the lower levels.

The unmistakable main finding in Table 11 is that what some might term "full-fledged" universities, i.e., type #411, offering "liberal arts and general curricula and including three or more professional schools," consistently received most of the funds each year. In 1963, 58 of the top 100 institutions were of this type. And there were 56 in 1966, 58 again in 1969, and 60 in 1970. Furthermore, all types of insti-

TABLE 10

Number and Percent of Control Types among Top 100 Academic Grantee Institutions (In Funds Received from All Private Foundations Studied)

	1963		1966		1969		1970	
Top 100 Grantee CUs in Total Dollars Received	*No.*	*Cum %*	*No.*	*Cum. %*	*No.*	*Cum. %*	*No.*	*Cum. %*
Control Types								
1. Private nonsectarian	51	51	46	46	44	44	45	45
2. Protestant	11	62	15	61	14	58	17	62
3. Catholic	7	69	5	66	5	63	4	66
4. Greek Orthodox	0		0		0		0	
5. Federal	0		0		1	64	1	67
6. State	28	97	28	94	30	94	29	96
7. County	0		0	94	1	95	0	
8. City	2	99	2	96	2	97	1	97
9. Miscellaneous	0		1	97	2	99	3	100
10. N. A.	1	100	3	100	1	100	0	
	100		100		100		100	

TABLE 11

Number and Percent of Functional Types among Top 100 Academic Grantee Institutions (In Funds Received from All Private Foundations Studied)

Functional Types: Top 100 CUs in Total Dollars Received	1963		1966		1969		1970	
	No.	Cum. %	No.	Cum. %	No.	Cum. %	No.	Cum. %
AUC Level I (Misc.)								
101 Misc.	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
AUC Level II, only bachelor's and/or 1st professional degree								
202 L.A.; General	1		4		4		2	
205 L.A.; Gen.; & Teacher Prep.	4		11		7		7	
206 Ditto; plus terminal occ'nl.	1		2		1		2	
208 Prof'nl; Techn'l; & Teacher Prep.	0		0		1		0	
210 L.A.; Gen.; with 1-2 Prof'nl Schls.	2	10	3	20	0	13	2	13
AUC Level III, master's and/or 2nd professional degree								
302 L.A.; General	1		2		2		3	
305 L.A.; Gen.; & Teacher Prep.	7		6		5		2	
306 Ditto, plus terminal occ'nl	1		2		1		1	
308 Prof'nl; Techn'l; & Teacher Prep.	1		1		0		0	
310 L.A.; Gen.; with 1-2 Prof'nl Schls.	1		1		1		1	
311 L.A.; Gen.; with 3 or more P.S.	6	24	5	37	3	24	3	23
AUC Level IV, doctorate and equivalent degrees								
402 L.A.; General	1		1		0		0	
405 L.A.; Gen.; & Teacher Prep.	1		1		1		1	
406 Ditto, plus terminal occ'nl	1		0		0		0	
407 Prof'nl only; no Teacher Prep.	3		1		4		3	
408 Prof'nl; Techn'l; Teacher Prep.	3		1		2		2	
410 L.A.; Gen.; with 1-2 Prof'nl Schls.	2		1		3		3	
411 L.A.; Gen.; with 3 or more P.S.	58	93	56	98	58	92	60	92
AUC Level V, Other								
5Y1 Junior Colleges	1	94	1	99	3	95	2	95
5Y2 Medical Colleges	1	95	0	99	2	97	2	97
5Y3 Theological Schools	1	96	1	100	1	98	1	98
5Y4 Miscellaneous	4	100	0	100	2	100	3	100

tutions in Level IV taken together, i.e., the 7 subtypes all offering the doctorate or equivalent degrees, made up close to two-thirds of the top 100 CUs each year. (The range was from 61 of 100 in 1966 to 70 of 100 in 1970.)

Only two other types of CUs consistently had as many as three representatives in the top 100. One was type #205, multipurpose colleges not offering graduate work (institutions some might designate as "liberal arts colleges which also train teachers below the master's level"). The other was type #311, institutions having three or more professional schools but not offering doctorate level work.

Where did each year's top 100 CUs tend to be located? Table 12 shows the considerable dispersion evident by individual state. New York led, with an average of 10.0 of the top 100 CU grantees each year. Texas averaged 8.2; Pennsylvania, 7.0; Massachusetts, 6.5; California, 6.2; and North Carolina and Ohio, 5.2, each year. (All of the states mentioned are themselves headquarters of large foundations, but separate study would be necessary to assess causality or coincidence.) The rest of the top 100 CUs were quite extensively scattered.[12]

Table 13's regional categorizations of the same grantees remove only some of the dispersion evident in some of the distributions just reported by state. (The regions listed are accreditation-types commonly used, even though they contain unequal numbers of states, differing extensively in population and other important characteristics.) For example, the Mid-Atlantic Region (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) which stood out in location of foundation headquarters, is at or near the top in percent of CUs within any year's top 100—the average being 19.5% and the range 17 to 23. The South Atlantic Region, however, ranks nearly the same in the years studied: the average there is 17.7% of the top 100 colleges, with the range also slightly lower, from 13 to 20. So does the East North Central Region, which averaged 17.2% of the top 100 CUs each year also, and had a range of 13 to 24.

The other regions ranked in order of average CUs within a top 100 each year were: New England, 10.2; West South Central, 10.2; West North Central, 7.5; Pacific, 7.5; Mountain, 4.7; East South Central, 4.7; and Hawaii and Alaska, .5.

---

[12] A possible exception is Georgia, which had 7 colleges in the top 100 in 1966. The Georgia grantees were "predominantly Negro" colleges and the grants were from The Ford Foundation, which subsequently broadened such giving to other states, after cutting back its extensive development grants to private (predominantly white) liberal arts colleges and universities after 1966. See Ford (1966).

TABLE 12

State Location of Top 100 Academic Grantee Institutions (In Funds Received from All Private Foundations Studied)

States of Top 100 CUs in Total Dollars Received	1963	1966	1969	1970
Alabama	0	2	1	1
Alaska	0	0	1	0
Arizona	1	1	1	0
Arkansas	0	0	0	0
California	8	4	9	4
Colorado	2	0	3	3
Connecticut	2	2	2	2
Delaware	0	1	2	0
Florida	1	1	3	3
Georgia	0	7	4	1
Hawaii	0	1	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0	0

[Continued]

TABLE 12 [*Continued*]

States of Top 100 CUs in Total Dollars Received	1963	1966	1969	1970
Illinois	3	5	2	3
Indiana	6	2	3	3
Iowa	0	1	1	1
Kansas	0	0	0	1
Kentucky	1	0	0	0
Louisiana	1	3	1	1
Maine	0	0	0	0
Maryland	3	1	2	2
Massachusetts	6	4	7	9
Michigan	4	5	4	5
Minnesota	2	2	2	3
Mississippi	0	1	0	0
Missouri	2	3	2	3
Montana	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	2	3	0	2
Nevada	1	1	1	1
New Hampshire	1	1	1	0
New Jersey	3	3	2	2
New Mexico	0	1	0	1
New York	11	8	10	11
North Carolina	4	6	5	6
North Dakota	0	0	0	0
Ohio	10	5	4	2
Oklahoma	2	0	0	0
Oregon	1	1	0	0
Pennsylvania	6	7	5	10
Rhode Island	1	0	1	0
South Carolina	0	0	1	0
South Dakota	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	3	4	3	3
Texas	7	6	12	8
Utah	0	1	1	0
Vermont	0	2	0	0
Virginia	0	1	1	3
Washington	0	1	1	1
West Virginia	1	0	1	3
Wisconsin	1	1	1	1
Wyoming	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	4	2	2	1
	100	100	100	100

TABLE 13

Regional Location of Top 100 Academic Grantee Institutions (In Total Funds Received from All Private Foundations Studied)

Regions of Top 100 CUs in Total Dollars Received	1963 No. & %	1966 No. & %	1969 No. & %	1970 No. & %
New England	(10)	(9)	(11)	(11)
Connecticut	2	2	2	2
Maine	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	6	4	7	9
New Hampshire	1	1	1	0
Rhode Island	1	0	1	0
Vermont	0	2	0	0
Mid-Atlantic	(20)	(18)	(17)	(23)
New Jersey	3	3	2	2
New York	11	8	10	11
Pennsylvania	6	7	5	10
East North Central	(24)	(18)	(13)	(14)
Illinois	3	5	2	3
Indiana	6	2	2	3
Michigan	4	5	4	5
Ohio	10	5	4	2
Wisconsin	1	1	1	1
West North Central	(6)	(9)	(5)	(10)
Iowa	0	1	1	1
Kansas	0	0	0	1
Minnesota	2	2	2	3
Missouri	2	3	2	3
Nebraska	2	3	0	2
North Dakota	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	0	0	0	0
South Atlantic	(13)	(19)	(20)	(19)
District of Columbia	4	2	2	1
Delaware	0	1	2	0
Florida	1	1	3	3
Georgia	0	7	4	1
Maryland	3	1	1	2
North Carolina	4	6	5	6
South Carolina	0	0	1	0
Virginia	0	1	1	3
West Virginia	1	0	1	3
East South Central	(4)	(7)	(4)	(4)
Alabama	0	2	1	1
Kentucky	1	0	0	0
Mississippi	0	1	0	0
Tennessee	3	4	3	3

[Continued]

TABLE 13 [*Continued*]

Regions of Top 100 CUs in Total Dollars Received	1963 No. & %	1966 No. & %	1969 No. & %	1970 No. & %
West South Central	(10)	(9)	(13)	(9)
Arkansas	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	1	3	1	1
Oklahoma	2	0	0	0
Texas	7	6	12	8
Mountain	(4)	(4)	(6)	(5)
Arizona	1	1	1	0
Colorado	2	0	3	3
Idaho	0	0	0	0
Montana	0	0	0	0
Nevada	1	1	1	1
New Mexico	0	1	0	1
Utah	0	1	1	0
Wyoming	0	0	0	0
Pacific	(9)	(6)	(10)	(5)
California	8	4	9	4
Oregon	1	1	0	0
Washington	0	1	1	1
Other	(0)	(1)	(1)	(0)
Alaska	0	0	1	0
Hawaii	0	1	0	0
	100	100	100	100

Conclusions and Discussion

The main findings of this study simply help answer some general questions often asked about where the funds of large foundations actually go within U.S. higher education. Providing part of such heretofore hard-to-find information has been the main purpose of this study, and of the development of the Fundflow computer program on which it is based.

Tables 1-3 show that in each of the periods considered—1963, 1966, 1969, and 1970 as reported in the grants index of FN—about half of the 276 very large U.S. foundations studied actually made at least one grant to a specific U.S. college or university identifiable by name. But The Ford Foundation gave at least 12% of the total number, and at least 17% of the total dollar amount, of the grants reported each separate year. And when all actual grantor foundations (including Ford) were ranked on the percent of total funds granted, a "top 25" such foundations gave at least 46% of the total number of grants each year, that lowest year being 1966. The "top 25" foundations gave at least 75% of each year's total dollar value in grants, the lowest year being 1970. The most these top 25 foundations gave was 71% of the total number of grants (in 1963), and 84% of the total dollar value in funds granted (in 1966). When the top 100 foundations (again including Ford) are considered, it can be seen that they made at the lowest (1970) over 86% of all the academic grants studied, and provided over 96% of the actual funds involved (again in 1970). At the highest (1963) the top 100 gave over 98% of the total number of grants and over 99% of the funds involved (again in 1963).

The first three tables, then, show extensive concentration of actual grant making, despite a

slight but definite trend toward dispersion, e.g., toward an increase in the percent of the 276 large foundations actually making academic grants, from 41% or 112 of 276 in 1963, to 67% or 184 of 276 in 1970. This particular concentration pattern lasted through a fairly steady increase in the number of grants reported: 789 in 1963, 1,176 in 1966, 1,319 in 1969, and 1,496 in 1970. It also persisted through a marked movement toward awarding (or at least reporting) more actual funds each period, from about $109 million in 1963 to about $210 million in 1970. The overall trend for most of the academic grants to be made by relatively few of the large foundations was declining slightly, but far less so for the proportion of total funds the top foundations awarded than for the total number of grants they made each year.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 bring out clearly that the foundations with the broadest formal purposes were more apt to be actual academic grantors; that at least half of such foundations were based in the Mid-Atlantic Region, especially in New York; and that although over a third of the top 100 foundations each year, including, of course, The Ford Foundation, had assets of over $50 million, it was more common for academic grants to come from foundations with assets in the $10-19.9 million range.

Tables 7, 8, and 9 indicate that increases both in the frequency of the grants and in the number of foundations involved did not tend to change the ratio of grantees to grantors: that ratio ranged from 2.6 to 3.1 CUs per foundation per year; the average was 2.8. They also show that a top 5 CUs got about 26% of the funds each separate year, that a top 25 tended to get somewhat more than half, and a top 100 got over 80% of the funds. In number of grants, rather than dollar total, the concentration was not so extensive, but actually diminished slightly, if irregularly. Still, a top 100 of a potential of at least 2,500 grantee institutions tended to get the majority of grants each year.

Tables 10 through 13 make it evident that there was much more dispersion in the location of the top 100 recipients than in the control types and functional types they represented. New York did average at least 10 of the top 100 CUs each year; and the Mid-Atlantic Region (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) led the rest with an average of 19.5 per year. But wherever located, the major grantees were usually private institutions; such CUs constituted about two-thirds of the top 100 recipients (in total dollars received from all the foundations studied each year). State institutions made up at least 28 of such top 100 CU recipients each year. In functional types, it was usually universities having both liberal arts and general curricula and including three or more professional schools which received most of the money. From 56 to 60 such universities were in the top 100 grantees each year.

Interpretations of the larger significance of such findings should probably await more precise comparisons, for example, of the extent to which the same grantors and grantees are in top ranks each year in both foundation and federal funding. Sample preliminary efforts along that line are presented in the Appendix (Tables A-E).

Table A shows that 10 foundations, including Ford, made about 32% of the grants, and that those grants constituted about 55% of the total funds from 184 actual grantors (among the 276 foundations studied) reported in *FN* in 1970. A top 50 such foundations made over 62% of the grants, constituting about 85% of the funds going to specifically identifiable U.S. colleges and universities.

Table B indicates that of the top 50 U.S. CUs in dollars received from the 184 grantor foundations reported in 1970, the top 10 received about 38% and the top 25 about 53% of the total funds received by the 515 CUs getting such funds that year. One public institution was among the top 10, 5 more were among the top 15 to 25 recipients; and all 6 were universities.

Table C is partly based on a report from the National Science Foundation (1971) indicating that a top 100 institutions were designated for about $2.3 billion in federal obligations in fiscal year 1970, an amount representing about 71% of the total federal obligations of $3.2 billion for U.S. higher education that year. Sixty-four percent of the latter total came from one agency, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.[13] (Both federal totals just cited exclude amounts for federally funded research and development centers, usually linked to large universities.) Table C shows that of the top 50 institutions involved, half were public, half were private, and all were universities. It also indicates that at least half of these top 50 universities in federal obligations were also in the top 50 in funds obtained from the large foundations studied here (as reported in *FN* in 1970).

Surprising or not, and whatever their import for future philanthropic or federal policy, these first three Appendix tables show in a more detailed and

[13] In 1971, this concentration declined to 69% for a top 100 institutions. Within the top 10 in FY 1971 were 8 which had been in the top 10 FY 1970; the top 25 in FY 1971 included 23 from the top 25 in FY 1970 (NSF 1971, 1972).

comparative way than has heretofore been available, some of the specific processes underlying the general trends already mentioned. These include the similar foundation and federal emphasis on universities, the foundations' much greater attention to private institutions, and the shared large concentration of actual funds in a small percent of the potential U.S. recipients.

Subsequent research, of course, should acknowledge more the reported general and specific purposes for which the funds are provided. Although these are not always clearly stated, spokesmen for some of the more prominent foundations argue, for example, that their funds are meant to be "risk capital" rather than regular and conventional income (Cf., Colvard, 1961, 1964). Federal funds obviously often go for the purchase of research and at times include allocations based in part on geographic criteria. Somewhat similarly, it is unquestionably true that the sorting of CUs in this country as either "public" or "private" is at least in part arbitrary, from what we know of the general tendency for public funds to become very important to many kinds of colleges and universities formally "private" in various legal and administrative respects. But when these, and many other possible clarifications are made, and *caveats* (such as the percent of students on scholarships) are included, it would still seem to be important to recognize overall comparisons of the sort attempted in Tables A-C.

Such tables show details of recipient CUs and degrees of concentration of funds not evident in present separate and summary reports. For example, at a time (1970) when there were 2,556 potential CU recipients of federal and large philanthropic funds (*Yearbook*, 1972, Table 24, p. 307, based on fall 1970 opening enrollments reported by HEW), *federal* support exclusive of moneys allocated to federally funded research and development centers associated with universities and colleges came to $3.2 billion (Table C, FY 1970). A total of 2,350 CUs (1,247 private, 1,103 public) received some of these funds (NSF, 1973, p. viii). But nearly $2.3 billion (about 70.9%) went to a "top 100" CUs. And a "top 25" universities, about 1% of the 2,556 total, received 49.7% of that $2.3 billion, or about 35.2% of the overall $3.2 billion.

The initial Fundflow analysis, already generally reported here, identified in the grants index sections of *FN* for 1970 some $210.2 million in grants distributed to 515 specific U.S. CUs by the 276 large foundations singled out for special study. It has already been indicated that a "top 100" CUs got 83.7% of that 1970 total. But Table B shows the "top 25" among them, which received 52.7% of the $210.2 million granted that year.[14] And, to show another set of figures, possible through comparison of Tables B and C, the "top 10" institutions (all universities) in federal funds received 17.8% of the overall $3.2 billion from that source, whereas the "top 10"[15] among those sharing the grants traced to the 276 large foundations in *FN* 1970 received a more concentrated 37.9% of that $210.2 million.

Comparisons of Tables B and C can also show that 38 of the top 50 CUs in 1970 (in total dollars received from all foundations in the study) were private institutions; 12 were public institutions. The private CUs received $122.2 million or about 58.1% of the overall approximately $210.2 million from all foundations studied, and about 81.9% of the $149.3 million going to the top 50 institutions (public and private). The public CUs got $27 million of the foundation grants in 1970. That figure represented about 12.9% of the overall $210.2 million and 18.1% of the $143.9 million going to the top 50 institutions (public and private). In contrast, of the top 50 CUs in federal obligations for fiscal year 1970, 25 were private and 25 were public institutions. The 25 private institutions received close to $836.6 million (about 25.9%) of the nearly $3.3 billion in overall federal obligations, and around 49.4% of the nearly $1.6 billion in obligations to the top 50 in federal obligations that year. Quite similarly, the 25 public institutions got about $857.3 million (about 26.6%) of the approximate $3.3 billion in federal obligations for fiscal year 1970, and around 50.6% of the approximate $1.6 billion in federal obligations to the top 50 institutions (public and private) that year.

Obviously, further research should more definitely place such separate and comparative figures more clearly within the larger distribution of numbers of private and public CUs, and of overall sums for U.S. higher education from all sources each year. Such trend analyses might both explain and reduce some of the special significance often attributed to foundation grants.[16] For as Tables D

---

[14] Twelve of these (Harvard U., Stanford U., U. of Michigan, U. of Pennsylvania, Yale U., Columbia U., M.I.T., Johns Hopkins U., Cornell U., U. of North Carolina, U. of Wisconsin, and U. of Chicago) were also among the top 25 in federal funding (Table B, FY 1970 for federal funds)

[15] Four of these (U. of Michigan, Harvard U., Stanford U., and Columbia U.), were in the "top 10" from both sources, i.e., federal and large foundation funds.

[16] See, for example, the various aspects of this question brought out in Andrews (1956), Colvard (1961, 1964), Weaver (1967), Reeves (1970), Domhoff (1967, 1970), Horowitz (1970), Cuninggim (1972), Nielsen (1972), and Heimann (1973).

(Ferriss, 1969) and E (Bowen, 1971) make clear, total private giving to, or through, U.S. colleges and universities has tended to constitute no more than 5% to 9% of all revenues of our various institutions of higher education since 1930, and the secular trend is toward a predicted 4%. It is likely that more detailed research of the sort recommended and briefly illustrated here would find a consistent intensive concentration of the majority of large foundation grant dollars in far fewer of the total U.S. CUs than is actually revealed in the summary figures usually made available, i.e., figures on funds going not to specific colleges and universities but rather to various types of institutions. If so, such a finding might strongly suggest that, at least in the last 40 years or so, large foundations' grants have been prized as much or more for their scarcity as for their essentiality.

References

Andrews, F. E. *Philanthropic foundations.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1956.

Andrews, F. E. Introduction. In M. O. Lewis (Ed.), *The foundation directory.* (3rd ed.) New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Bowen, H. R. Who pays the higher education bill? In M. D. Orwig (Ed.), *Financing higher education: Alternatives for the federal government.* ACT Monograph Five. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1971.

Colvard, R. Foundations and professions: The organizational defense of autonomy. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 1961, **6**(2), 167-184.

Colvard, R. Risk capital philanthropy: The ideological defense of innovation. In G. K. Zollschan & W. Hirsch (Eds.), *Explorations in social change.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.

Cuninggim, M. *Private money and public service.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Domhoff, G. W. *Who rules America?* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Domhoff, G. W. *The higher circles.* New York: Random House, 1970.

Ferriss, A. L. *Indicators of trend in American education.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

The Ford Foundation. *Annual Report.* New York: 1966.

Foundation News. Vols. IV, VII, X, XI. New York: The Council on Foundations, 1963, 1966, 1969, 1970.

Heimann, F. (Ed.) *The future of foundations.* American Assembly, Columbia University. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Horowitz, I. L., & Horowitz, R. L. Tax-exempt foundations: Their effects on national policy. *Science,* 1970, **168,** 220-228.

Levi, J., & Vorsanger, F. A. *Patterns of giving to higher education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Lewis, M. O. (Ed.) *The foundation directory.* (3rd ed.) New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

National Science Foundation. *Science resource studies highlights,* June 11, 1971. Washington, D.C.: NSF 71-16, 1971; and *Highlights,* September 22, 1972, NSF 72-316, 1972.

National Science Foundation. *Federal support to universities, colleges, and selected nonprofit institutions, fiscal year, 1971.* Washington, D.C.: NSF 73-300, 1973.

Nielsen, W. A. *The big foundations.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.

Reeves, T. C. (Ed.) *Foundations under fire.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1970.

Rosenquist, C. Academic colonialism. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, 1954, **35**, 3-10.

Singletary, O. A. (Ed.) *American universities and colleges*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

U.S. Congress, House, Select Committee on Small Business. *Tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts: Their impact on our economy*. Subcommittee Chairman's Report to Subcommittee No. 1, 90th Congress. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. *Directory of U.S. institutions of higher education, fall, 1967*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Yearbook of higher education. Orange, N.J.: Academic Media, 1972.

APPENDIX

TABLE A

Top 50 Large Private Foundations, 1970

	Amount	%	Cum. %	No.	%	Cum. %
1. Ford Foundation	$43,780,968	20.8		198	13.2	
2. Danforth Foundation	16,853,194	8.0		13	.8	
3. D. & L. Rosenstiel Foundation	11,131,660	5.2		14	.9	
4. Rockefeller Foundation	10,924,986	5.1		87	5.8	
5. Kellogg Foundation	7,908,908	3.7		30	2.0	
6. Commonwealth Foundation	6,790,067	3.2		21	1.3	
7. J. A. Hartford Foundation, Inc.	5,454,939	2.5		29	1.9	
8. Pew Memorial Trust	4,781,166	2.2		43	2.8	
9. Surdna Foundation, Inc.	4,407,500	2.0		13	.8	
10. Alfred P. Sloan Foundation	4,343,281	2.0	54.7	44	2.9	32.4
11. Brown Foundation, Inc.	4,320,785	2.0		1		
12. Kresge Foundation	4,274,750	2.0		52	3.4	
13. Eugene C. Eppley Foundation	3,391,000	1.6		3	.1	
14. E. & E. Woodruff Foundation	3,387,300	1.6		2	.1	
15. W. R. Kenan, Jr. Charitable Trust	3,250,000	1.5		4	.2	
16. C. E. Merrill Trust	2,682,761	1.2		30	2.0	
17. Eastman Kodak Charitable Trust	2,625,000	1.2		5	.3	
18. Otto Haas Trust No. 2	2,500,000	1.1		3	.1	
19. Sarah M. Scaife Foundation	2,259,500	1.0		8	.5	
20. Carnegie Corporation	2,092,315	.9		23	1.5	
21. Charles A. Dana Foundation	2,040,000	.9		17	1.1	
22. Sid W. Richardson Foundation	2,039,500	.9		4	.2	
23. C. W. Benedum Foundation	1,949,783	.9		13	.8	
24. Z. S. Reynolds Trust	1,893,375	.9		15	1.0	
25. Lilly Endowment	1,870,000	.8	73.2	24	1.6	45.3

Note.—Foundations with assets of at least $8 million and making at least one grant of at least $10,000 to a U.S. college or university specifically identified in the grants index of *Foundation News*, 1970.

TABLE A [*Continued*]

	Amount	%	Cum. %	No.	%	Cum. %
26. Rogosin Foundation	1,720,000	.8		7	.4	
27. M. C. Fleischmann Foundation	1,670,097	.7		18	1.2	
28. Moody Foundation	1,592,378	.7		11	.7	
29. C. S. Mott Foundation	1,436,500	.6		7	.4	
30. A. V. Davis Foundation	1,350,000	.6		21	1.3	
31. Bush Foundation	1,321,000	.6		5	.3	
32. I. H. Given & J. LaPorte Foundation	1,320,161	.6		3	.1	
33. Charles Hayden Foundation	1,220,000	.5		14	.9	
34. J. M. Morehead Foundation	1,188,164	.5		2	.1	
35. Richard K. Mellon Foundation	1,070,000	.5		18	1.2	
36. H. L. & G. Doherty Foundation	1,033,463	.4		6	.3	
37. S. I. Newhouse Foundation	1,000,000	.4		1	—	
38. Grant Foundation	997,768	.4		11	.7	
39. Henry Luce Foundation	969,250	.4		10	.6	
40. Louis Calder Foundation	948,122	.4		19	1.2	
41. Russell Sage Foundation	908,268	.4		17	1.1	
42. L. W. & M. Hill Foundation	867,351	.4		15	1.0	
43. Frank J. Lewis Foundation	849,450	.4		12	.7	
44. Benwood Foundation, Inc.	770,600	.3		11	.7	
45. M. D. Anderson Foundation	765,000	.3		4	.2	
46. Committee of the Permanent Charity Fund	740,000	.3		6	.3	
47. Educational Facilities Laboratories	719,170	.3		24	1.6	
48. Booth Ferris Foundation	701,691	.3		7	.4	
49. Standard Oil (Indiana) Foundation	678,490	.3		17	1.1	
50. George Gund Foundation	674,000	.3	84.6	7	.4	62.2
Total (of 276 studied)	$210,228,798	100.0	100.0	1,496	100.0	100.0

TABLE B

Top 50 U.S. Colleges and Universities, 1970
in Dollars Granted from up to 184 Large Private Foundations
and as Compared with Rank in Total Federal Obligations, Fiscal Year 1970

Institution	Control Type	Amount	%	Cum. %	Rank in Federal Funding[a]
1. Washington University, Mo.	Priv.	$15,987,795	7.6		27
2. Harvard University, Mass.	Priv.	11,680,947	5.5		4
3. University of Miami, Fla.	Priv.	10,211,686	4.8		37
4. Stanford University, Calif.	Priv.	8,640,917	4.1		5
5. University of Michigan	Pub.	8,284,187	3.9		2
6. University of Pennsylvania	Priv.	7,197,739	3.4		19
7. Yale University, Conn.	Priv.	6,212,893	2.9		21
8. Rice University, Tex.	Priv.	4,570,785	2.1		-100
9. Emory University, Ga.	Priv.	4,146,219	1.9		68
10. Columbia University, N.Y.	Priv.	3,669,417	1.7	37.9	8
11. Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Priv.	3,579,976	1.7		1
12. Johns Hopkins University, Md.	Priv.	3,567,921	1.6		20
13. Cornell University, N.Y.	Priv.	2,853,583	1.3		17
14. University of Southern California	Priv.	2,809,963	1.3		34
15. University of North Carolina	Pub.	2,788,545	1.3		22
16. Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, N.Y.	Priv.	2,690,429	1.2		81
17. Princeton University, N.J.	Priv.	2,467,045	1.1		47
18. University of Nebraska	Pub.	2,444,000	1.1		-100
19. University of Wisconsin	Pub.	2,400,582	1.1		7
20. Carnegie-Mellon University, Pa.	Priv.	2,347,877	1.1		100
21. University of Rochester, N.Y.	Priv.	2,224,387	1.0		31
22. University of Chicago, Ill.	Priv.	2,198,763	1.0		15
23. Michigan State University	Pub.	1,902,117	-1.0		36
24. University of Calif. (unspecified)[b]	Pub.	1,874,479	-1.0		c
25. St. Louis University, Mo.	Priv.	1,829,400	-1.0	52.7	98

Note.—Of 276 foundations (each with assets of at least $8 million) studied, these 184 made at least one grant of at least $10,000 to a U.S. college or university specifically identified in the grants index of *Foundation News*, 1970.